DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 491 CS 500 157

AUTHOR Hill, Timothy A.
TITLE An Experimental Study of the Relationship Between the Opinionatedness of a Leader and Consensus in Group Discussions of Policy.
PUB DATE Dec 72
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Assn. (58th, Chicago, December 27-30, 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Science Research; Decision Making; *Discussion Groups; Group Behavior; *Group Dynamics; *Interaction Process Analysis; *Leadership Qualities; *Opinions; Problem Solving; Statistical Analysis

ABSTRACT

The author trained confederates to exhibit either opinionated, moderately opinionated, or unopinionated styles of leadership, then assigned them to discussion groups. Each group was assigned a specific topic and instructed to decide on a specific policy toward the topic. They were also asked to make ratings that measured four other attitudes: the degree of the group consensus, the leader's maintenance of his status, perceptions of the leader's credibility, and the members' satisfaction with the group outcome. Results of the study show that: (1) both unopinionated and moderately opinionated leadership appear to be related to achievement of group consensus; (2) varying degrees of opinionated leadership seem to relate consistently to member impressions of the leader's credibility; (3) the level of leader opinionatedness does not seem to relate directly to leadership maintenance or member impressions of dynamism; and (4) there seems to be no direct relationship between level of leader opinionatedness and members' satisfaction with the process. (Author/RN)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 073491

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE OPINIONATEDNESS OF A LEADER AND CONSENSUS IN GROUP DISCUSSIONS OF POLICY

Timothy A. Hill
Indiana University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Timothy A. Hill
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Debut in Interpersonal and Small Group Communication
Speech Communication Association
Annual Meeting
December 29, 1972

CS 500 153

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE OPINIONATEDNESS OF A LEADER AND CONSENSUS IN GROUP DISCUSSIONS OF POLICY

Timothy A. Hill
Indiana University

The exploration of the role of the leader in small groups has been central to the bulk of research on group phenomena.[1] Further, the process of group decision-making has also recently come to the fore as a principal interest of research.[2] The illuminative research, however, on leadership behavior as it relates to decision-making has been scarce.

Of the four general methodological approaches to leadership research (trait, stylistic, situational, and functional), the first two have generally been unfruitful in relating leadership to group outcomes. Stogdill (1948), in his review of trait research, outlined five major areas of "successful" leadership traits that received partial support: capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, and status.[3] A successful leader, however, as interpreted in trait research, is one who successfully emerges to a position of leadership, and thus possesses traits that distinguish him from a non-leader, or one who does not rise to a position of leadership. Hence, leadership traits were not effectively related to group outcomes.

Stylistic leadership research has also failed to yield many significant conclusions about the effects of leadership style on decision-making. For example, White and Lippett (1960) found a democratic leader to be the "best" style of leader, not in terms of consensus, but in terms of group cohesiveness, member satisfaction with group activities, and independent behavior exhibited by the subjects.[4]

Some of the research growing out of the situational approach has come closer to dealing directly with leadership and group outcomes. Korten (1962) found that an authoritarian leader is best when group goals demand more attention than individual goals and when situational factors obstruct goal achievement; when individual goals demand more attention than group goals and when situational factors do not inhibit goal achievement, the democratic leader will be superior.[5] Fiedler (1968) demonstrated that (1) the effectiveness of a group is contingent on the appropriateness of the leader's style to the specific situation in which he operates, and (2) the type of leadership style that will be most effective depends upon the degree to which the group situation allows the leader to exert influence.[6] Preston and Heintz (1949) found that psychologically distant leaders are more effective with task-oriented groups and psychologically close leaders are more effective with group-oriented tasks.[7]

The research centering around the situational conceptual framework has been significant in that it has shown the dependence of leadership effectiveness on situational variables, but the conclusions about specific kinds of behavior that leaders should perform to aid in the group decision-making process is not nearly as clear. The definitions of authoritarian or psychologically distant leaders, carry-overs from the more stylistic and even trait-oriented approaches to leadership research, can hardly be said to be very explicit in behavioral terms.

The fourth and, according to some,[8] the most fruitful direction for small group research is the functional approach.[9] Gouran (1968) found that "successful" groups produce statements which are less opinionated, more informative, more provocative, more objective, and more goal oriented than are statements which occur in less successful discussions.[10] Knutson

(1970) experimentally manipulated orientation behavior and found that groups which contained confederates exhibiting behavior high in orientation came closer to consensus (total agreement on the policy decided) than groups containing neutral orientation or negative orientation confederates.[11] Russell (1970), in dealing directly with the leadership phenomenon, found that leaders who maintain their leadership statusare generally less opinionated and elicit more expressions of support than leaders who fail to maintain their leadership status.[12] Lumsden (1972) made three significant findings of note: (1) leaders who manifest significant amounts of agreement behavior elicit expressions of support more often than leaders who exhibit low agreement behavior, (2) groups with leaders who express agreement move further toward consensus than groups whose leaders express little or no agreement, and (3) high agreement leaders are perceived as being more objective than neutral or low agreement leaders. Her findings of the relation of high agreement leadership behavior to leadership maintenance were inconclusive, however.[13]

The most instructive background research to the following study seems to be the Gouran, Knutson, Russell, and Lumsden studies. Gouran's exploratory research indicated that behavior high in orientation, low in opinionatedness, high in objectivity, and high in informativeness contributed to achievement of consensus. Knutson's experimental study gave support to the variable of orientation behavior as being essential to group consensus. Russell's exploratory research indicated that high agreement and low opinionated leadership behavior were consistently related to leadership maintenance, and Lumsden's experimental study gave some support for high agreement behavior as facilitating consensus and influencing impressions of the leader.

On the basis of previous research, there is justification in assuming that the variable of opinionatedness plays a major role in decision-making groups. The present study proposed to investigate the variable of opinionatedness, specifically as exhibited by group leaders, and its relationship to (1) achievement of consensus, (2) leadership maintenance, (3) perceptions of the leader's credibility, and (4) member satisfaction with the group process.

METHOD

Independent Variable

The independent variable in this study was opinionatedness. The definition was the same as the one originally used by Gouran; that is, "a statement is said to be opinionated if it reflects a feeling, belief, or judgment, the factual basis of which is not apparent in the statement itself."[14] In his study, Russell exemplified degrees of opinionatedness in the following manner:[15]

Opinionated statement:	"No man, that's just the fault of the radicals on campus."
Moderately opinionated statement:	"The rallies testify to the dissatisfaction of the majority of the students."
Unopinionated statement:	"It's like Byrum Carter said, this University must satisfy the needs of the majority of the students."

These three levels of opinionatedness were chosen to be the three conditions of the independent variable for this study.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variable of primary interest in this study was consensus. Gouran's investigation indicated that there was a positive relationship between general group statements of unopinionatedness and consen-

sus groups. In his subsequent study, Russell observed unopinionated statements spoken specifically by group leaders as being crucial in the operation of decision-making groups, although he did not draw conclusions about the relationship of opinionated leadership behavior to consensus. Thus it was hypothesized that groups having unopinionated statements deliberately injected into their discussions by the leaders would come closer to consensus than their counterparts with moderately opinionated or opinionated leaders.

Consensus, as it was operationally defined, was the degree of personal agreement of all members in a task-oriented group over a policy ultimately chosen by the group as a whole. After each group discussion, the leader was asked to articulate the decision made by the group. Each of the group members was then asked to rate, on a scale from one to seven, hiw own agreement with the group policy. A total consensus group, therefore, was one in which all group members rated the group policy as their own personal choice (i.e., everyone would be marking the seventh point on the scale: "I absolutely, completely agree with the group decision").

The second dependent variable was leadership maintenance. Russell found that his high maintenance leaders were generally less opinionated than their low maintenance counterparts on the basis of ratings of a random sample of the leaders' statements made by independent judges. Therefore there was a basis for predicting that group leaders who are intentionally unopinionated will maintain their leadership status more effectively than leaders who do not manifest that kind of communication behavior. Leadership maintenance was operationally defined as the rank given to the leader by the other members, based on their perceptions of the relative amount of influence exerted. Each discussant was asked to rank order everybody in the group according to influence over the total group pro-

cess, and thus it was possible to compare the rankings of the leaders across all conditions of the independent variable.

The third dependent variable was leader's credibility, or member impressions of the leader. Intuitively, it would seem that being credible would be essential to a leader's ability to lead. If opinionatedness were indeed a crucial factor in a group's reaching consensus or in a leader's maintenance of his status, there should be differences as well in the members' ratings of their leader's credibility according to what level of opinionatedness was being exhibited. Therefore, it was hypothesized that unopinionated leaders would create a social climate characterized by higher credibility ratings than the moderately opinionated or opinionated leaders. The instrument employed in the measurement of this dependent variable was a set of four seven-point scales, each testing one of Whitehead's four factors of credibility: objectivity, dynamism, trustworthiness, and competence.[16]

The final dependent variable was member satisfaction with the group process. As Gouran states: "If the ability of an individual to contribute meaningfully to a group effort depends on his satisfaction with the group's previous decision, which experience would indicate is the case, then we must learn what maximizes such feelings."[17] Discussants were asked to rate on seven-point scales their level of satisfaction with the process of the group ("How satisfied were you with the way your group went about reaching a decision?"). It was believed that unopinionatedness would be successfully related to a high level of member satisfaction.

Topic

The topic chosen for the discussion groups was the following: "Should the faculty and students of Indiana University issue a joint, public statement condemning the Vietnam war and calling for an immediate

withdrawal of all American troops?" Pretesting indicated that from a list of potential topics of interest to college students this particular one was of moderate interest value (i.e., neither too boring nor too emotionally stimulating and ego-involving) and contained a wide range of opinions.[18]

General Procedure

Subjects were 149 students chosen from the beginning speech classes at Indiana University.[19] They were assigned to participate in one of the 30 discussion groups. The subjects were scheduled so that no two people from the same class would be in the same group and, theoretically, everyone would be unacquainted. As the discussants entered their assigned rooms, they were seated around a table on which a tape recorder microphone had been placed. At each place around the table there was a copy of a sheet of instructions which informed the participants of what the discussion topic was to be. It also suggested an agenda for reaching a decision, presented some information on "The War" and on "College Statements on the War," and outlined four possible policies upon which the group could decide.

After the rooms had filled with the appointed number of participants, and after everyone had been given a chance to read the instructions, the investigator entered and recorded the names of those who were present for the benefit of the speech instructors.[20] He then briefly repeated the information on the instruction sheet and answered questions, explaining that the purpose of the discussion was to determine student opinion on the topic and that the group must arrive at one of the policies or formulate one of their own that would be agreeable to everyone. One member of the group was "randomly" selected as leader to help direct the group toward reaching the decision. The investigator then instructed the group

to begin, he turned on the tape recorder and left the room, and at the end of thirty minutes he returned to turn off the tape recorder and to administer the post-discussion questionnaire.

The data items gathered from the questionnaire were the following: a measure of consensus (the group leader was asked to voice the decision of the group at the end of the discussion and the members indicated their level of agreement with that decision), a measure of leadership maintenance (each group member ranked every other member including themselves according to amount of influence exerted over the group process), a measure of leader credibility (each member filled in seven-point scales of the four dimensions of credibility), and a measure of member satisfaction with the group process (each member filled in a seven-point scale of this variable). The purpose of the tape recorder was to record statements of the leader for a later analysis by independent judges of the degree of opinionatedness exhibited in these statements.

The manipulation of the independent variable was accomplished by the leader in each of the group discussions. Rather than merely being "randomly" chosen, as the naive group members were led to believe, this person had already been told the purposes of the experiment and had already gone through several training sessions to prepare him or her to be an opinionated leader, a moderately opinionated leader, and an unopinionated leader. There were five of these confederate leaders, two undergraduate females, one undergraduate male, and two male graduate students, each of whom had had some form of previous course instruction in small group communication. Each confederate was required to conduct a total of six discussions, two as an opinionated leader, two as a moderately opinionated leader, and two as an unopinionated leader.[21]

As part of their training to be able to exhibit these conditions of opinionatedness, the confederates were given instruction concerning the definition and nature of opinionated and unopinionated statements,[22] together with a booklet of factual information taken from recent newspapers and magazines on the subject of the Vietnam war and college statements condemning the Vietnam war. It was pointed out to the confederates that such factual information, when presented in a discussion with its documentation, could qualify as being very unopinionated, while, with few minor changes and the addition of personal judgment references, it could be made to sound highly opinionated. It was also explained to the confederates that these items of factual information did not have to be memorized. It was permissable for them to present these items in a highly paraphrased or altered form so long as they were conforming to the correct format of the level of opinionatedness desired in that particular discussion. In addition, they were encouraged to use every opportunity they had in the discussion to exhibit this kind of behavior. Even in cases where they felt a statement of group orientation, agreement, or reinforcing of group cohesiveness was called for, they were asked to try also to present information at the same time so that their particular condition of opinionatedness could be maintained. Finally, the confederates were asked to advocate the most radical position of the four while they were being opinionated (since a leader who happened to be highly opinionated for two opposing sides of an argument would hardly be realistic) and to include a sampling of differing views during the unopinionated condition (although an exactly equal representation of all sides was not necessary). Even though the leader had been advocating one position throughout, however, he was instructed to voice the actual <u>group</u> decision at the end of the discussion rather than his position.

RESULTS

The Check of the Independent Variable

Five leader statements were randomly chosen from the tapes of each of the discussions. These transcribed statements were then submitted to five judges to be rated according to the variable of opinionatedness.[23] This served as an independent check of the manipulation of leadership opinionatedness and a verification that the confederates were indeed exhibiting three different levels of that kind of behavior. The reliability coefficient, a measure of the relative agreement of the judges' ratings, was computed by the intra-class correlation procedure. This statistic was found to be .8216 ($p < .005$). A simple analysis of variance of the three conditions was run to determine differences in the judges' ratings of the statements. In the computing of this analysis of variance, all judges' ratings were summed for each statement being rated. The means for the combined ratings and the analysis of variance table can be found in Tables 1 and 2. Significant differences were found among all conditions of the leader statements, and the differences were arranged in the expected order of magnitude. The high reliability of the judges' ratings, together with the differences they perceived in the independent variable, support the correct exhibition of the leaders' expected behavior in the groups.

The Dependent Variables

A simple analysis of variance was conducted for each of the dependent variables. These results can be seen in Tables 3-9. Significant F ratios were found for the consensus measure, for two measures of the credibility variable, competence and objectivity, and marginally for the credibility variable, trustworthiness. The follow-up analysis was made using the Newman-Keuls procedure for comparison of means. The findings of significance from these comparisons are found in Tables 10-13.

The results of the analysis of the relationship between leadership opinionatedness and consensus showed that groups whose leaders exhibited unopinionated behavior moved closer toward total consensus than those groups whose leaders were behaving in an opinionated manner. Also moderately opinionated leadership groups came closer to consensus than the opinionated condition groups. There was a marginal difference ($.10 > p > .05$) in the third comparison of this dependent variable, with moderately opinionated groups tending to score higher on consensus measures than the unopinionated groups.

The differences found on the measures of trustworthiness were also in the marginal range (below the .10 level) and showed a tendency for the unopinionated leaders to be rated more trustworthy than either the opinionated or moderately opinionated leaders.

Unopinionated leaders were rated as being significantly more competent (experienced, having a professional manner) than were the opinionated leaders. Again a marginal difference appeared between the opinionated and moderately opinionated conditions, with the latter appearing to score higher.

Unopinionated leaders were rated by their group members as being significantly more objective (fair, open-minded) than the opinionated leaders; moderately opinionated leaders were also rated higher on the measure of objectivity than the opinionated leaders.

DISCUSSION

The findings reported above tend to support the general notion that opinionated leadership behavior has certain critical effects upon the process and outcomes of small policy-making groups. In every case where there was a significant difference involving opinionated conditions, they were rated consistently lower than the groups of the less opinionated

leaders being compared to them. These differences showed up in the measures of consensus, the members' perceptions of their leaders' objectivity and competence, and marginally in the members' perceptions of their leaders' trustworthiness. Thus the original prescriptive tone of the predictions of this study would have to be altered. There is only partial support that unopinionated leadership behavior is superior, but there seems to be much stronger support that opinionated leadership behavior is inferior, at least in terms of consensus and some member impressions of leader credibility.

Both unopinionated and moderately opinionated leadership conditions apparently came closer to consensus than the opinionated conditions, but the surprising finding here was the last comparison which showed a tendency for the moderately opinionated groups to be coming closer to consensus than the unopinionated groups.[24] The basis for the difference here may lie in the role of orientation played by the different leaders. The opinionated leaders, because of their dogmatism and general refusal to give evidence for any statement they made, may have helped create a hostile climate in which the orientation to the final goal of the group was hampered. The moderately opinionated leaders may have appeared to their group members to be more nondirective and a more relaxed climate may have been fostered where orientation was facilitated. The knowledgeable unopinionated leaders, in turn, may have appeared to be such a rarity in an otherwise unrehearsed college discussion that they distracted the group from being totally oriented to the goal and scoring higher on the consensus measure. In listening to the tapes of the discussions, the investigator in fact noticed characteristics in some of the groups of the opinionated leadership condition which, in his judgment, were indications of an increased level of tension and hostility among the group members.

In spite of differences in the competence, objectivity and, partially, the trustworthiness ratings, this apparently had no connection to the leader's ability to maintain his status within the group since there were no differences across conditions in terms of leadership maintenance ratings.[25] Thus we have no evidence that a leader's ability to maintain his status is hampered by opinionated communication behavior, or that he is aided by unopinionated communication behavior.

Although not all of the credibility measures showed clearly significant differences, those differences found suggest that varying levels of opinionatedness do have effects on how group members perceive their leaders. No differences were found in ratings of dynamism, and even though the opinionated leaders had the largest mean ratings of the three conditions, there is no statistical evidence that leadership opinionatedness is consistently related to perceptions of a leader's dynamism. The differences that did occur were on objectivity, competence and, marginally, on trustworthiness, measures that are very close conceptually to the notion of "unopinionatedness." Thus there appeared to be an additional check that the leaders were perceived as exhibiting the behavior that was, in fact, required of them.

The final dependent measure, member satisfaction, also failed to reveal differences in the conditions of opinionated leadership. In spite of the relative trouble that groups with opinionated leaders had generally in trying to reach consensus, this did not seem to affect their overall satisfaction with how the groups operated. It may, in fact, be indicative of the contemporary student's familiarity with confrontation as a form of public discourse. He may, as a matter of course, encounter this kind of difficulty consistently in coming to a decision among his peers and may be generally "satisfied" with that kind of group process, believing it to be the norm.

SUMMARY

On the basis of the sample and the conditions of opinionatedness described in this study, the following conclusions may be drawn:

(1) Both unopinionated and moderately opinionated leadership behavior appear to be significantly related to achievement of consensus in small policy-making groups. There was, however, a tendency displayed in the results of this study for moderately opinionated leaders to be even more consensus-facilitating than unopinionated leaders.

(2) Varying degrees of opinionated leadership behavior seem to relate consistently to member impressions of the leader's credibility. Unopinionated leaders were rated as being more competent and objective than their opinionated counterparts, and there was marginal support that they were also seen as being more trustworthy. Moderately opinionated leaders also appeared to be more objective and competent than their opinionated counterparts.

(3) The level of leader opinionatedness does not seem to bear a consistent relationship with leadership maintenance.

(4) The level of leader opinionatedness does not appear to relate directly to group members' impressions of the leader's dynamism.

(5) The level of leader opinionatedness does not apparently bear a relationship to group members' impressions of their level of satisfaction with the group process.

FOOTNOTES

1. "Of all the topics studied by those interested in group dynamics, the nature of leadership has been investigated most persistently over a long period of time." Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, eds., Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, 3rd. ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 301.

2. Barry E. Collins and Harold Guetzkow, A Social Psychology of Group Processes for Decision-Making (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964).

3. Robert Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," Journal of Psychology, 25 (1948), 35-71.

4. Ralph White and Ronald Lippett, Autocracy and Democracy (New York: Harper and Row, 1960).

5. David Korten, "Situational Determinants of Leadership Structure," Journal of Conflict Resolution, 6 (1962), 222-235.

6. Fred E. Fiedler, "Personality and Situational Determinants of Leadership Effectiveness," in Cartwright and Zander, pp. 362-380.

7. M. G. Preston and R. K. Heintz, "Effects of Participatory vs. Supervisory Leadership on Group Judgment," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 44 (1949), 345-355.

8. See, for example, Dennis S. Gouran, "Conceptual and Methodological Approaches to the Study of Leadership," Central States Speech Journal, 21 (1970), 217-223.

9. By this point it should be clear that the distinctions between different approaches to leadership research are not concisely defined. A functional approach to leadership research also assumes that certain situations are present and, to a lesser extent, it assumes that leaders possess differing traits and use differing styles.

10. Dennis S. Gouran, "Variables Related to Consensus in Group Discussions of Questions of Policy," Speech Monographs, 36 (1968), 387-391.

11. Thomas J. Knutson, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Statements Giving Orientation on the Probability of Reaching Consensus in Group Discussions of Questions of Policy," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1970).

12. Hugh C. Russell, "An Investigation of Leadership Maintenance Behavior," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1970).

13. Gay Lumsden, "An Experimental Study of the Effect of Verbal Agreement on Leadership Maintenance in Problem-Solving Discussions," (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1972).

14. Gouran, "Variables Related to Consensus . . . ," 388.

15. Russell, pp. 211-212.

16. Jack L. Whitehead, Jr., "Factors of Source Credibility," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 54 (1969), 59-63.

17. Dennis S. Gouran, "Group Communication: Perspectives and Priorities for Future Research," paper delivered before the Speech Communication Association Convention, San Francisco, December 29, 1971.

18. The mean for this topic resulting from a rank ordering of eleven possible topics in terms of interest was 6.129. The ratings of agreement with this topic ranged from 1-7 (totally agree to totally disagree) with a mean of 4.387, a standard deviation of 2.1204 and a quartile deviation of 1.50.

19. Of these subjects, 46% were enrolled in S121, Public Speaking, 45% were enrolled in S122, Interpersonal Communication, and 9% were enrolled in S221, Speech and Human Behavior.

20. The motivation for having the students show up for this study varied with the instructors. Some dismissed one day of classes and therefore required that everyone attend. Others let this substitute as one small assignment in the class. For others, a system of extra credit was worked out for those from their sections who attended the discussion groups. The students were told that the purpose of the discussion groups was "to determine your opinions on a topic of current campus interest."

21. Thus there were 10 groups in each condition of opinionatedness. Of the 149 subjects, 48 were in opinionated leadership groups, 48 were in moderately opinionated leadership groups, and 53 were in unopinionated leadership groups. The numbers of participants in each group were kept fairly constant; there were never less than 5 nor more than 7 (counting the confederate leader). It may be noticed that in some of the ANOVA tables that follow, some of the n's may be slightly less than what is stated here. This is simply because some subjects did not respond to all items on the post-discussion questionnaire (e.g., on the consensus measure, one person in the unopinionated leadership condition did not respond and thus the n was reduced to 148, or 147 degrees of freedom).

22. One piece of research that was particularly helpful here was the work done by Kline in identifying the characteristics of statements that are consistently rated as opinionated or unopinionated. Some of his findings were the following: (1) unopinionated statements are more likely to contain questions, (2) statements of high opinionatedness are more stereotyped and predictable, and (3) highly opinionated statements can be recognized by a greater occurrence of self-reference words and the use of such phrases as "I think." John A. Kline, "Indices of Opinionated and Orienting Statements in Problem-Solving Discussions," Speech Monographs, 38 (1970), 282-286.

23. Chosen for the ratings were 50 statements of leaders in the unopinionated leadership condition, 45 from the moderately opinionated condition, and 50 from the opinionated condition. The reason for the difference in the number of statements being rated here was that a tape recorder in a moderately opinionated discussion failed to function properly. Thus there was no record of the leader's statements for that particular discussion and 5 less statements in the moderately opinionated condition to be rated.

24. The q value for this comparison was 2.69, and the threshold for significance at the .05 level for this comparison was only 2.85, so it was very close to $p \leq .05$ and not much beyond it.

25. It is interesting to note that Lumsden did not find a strong relationship between credibility and leadership maintenance in her study. High agreement leaders were rated significantly higher along the objectivity dimension of credibility, but her measures did not show them to be maintaining their leadership effectively.

TABLE 1
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - JUDGES' RATINGS OF LEADERS' STATEMENTS

		SS	df	MS	F
Between	Conditions of Opinionatedness	1745.9504	2	872.9752	21.371 ****
Within	Conditions of Opinionatedness	5800.5580	142	40.8490	
	Total	7546.5084	144		

**** Significant at the .005 level

TABLE 2
NEWMAN-KEULS COMPARISON OF MEANS - JUDGES' RATINGS OF LEADERS' STATEMENTS

Comparison	$\bar{X}_1$	$\bar{X}_2$	$\bar{D}$	q value
Opin. v. Mod. Opin.	26.9200	24.2667	2.6533	2.8579 **
Opin. v. Unopin.	26.9200	18.7200	8.2000	9.0721 ***
Mod. Opin. v. Unopin.	24.2667	18.7200	5.5467	5.9745 ***

(The 5 judges' ratings were combined for each statement)
** Significant at the .05 level
*** Significant at the .01 level

TABLE 3
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CONSENSUS

		SS	df	MS	F
Between	Conditions of Opinionatedness	45.4031	2	22.7015	7.5690****
Within	Conditions of Opinionatedness	434.8942	145	2.9993	
	Total	480.2973	147		

**** significant at the .005 level

TABLE 4
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - LEADERSHIP MAINTENANCE

	SS	df	MS	F
Between Conditions of Opinionatedness	1.2901	2	.6451	.1911
Within Conditions of Opinionatedness	492.8978	146	3.3760	
Total	494.1879	148		

TABLE 5
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CREDIBILITY (TRUSTWORTHINESS)

	SS	df	MS	F
Between Conditions of Opinionatedness	15.9473	2	7.9737	2.8991*
Within Conditions of Opinionatedness	396.0527	144	2.7504	
Total	412.0000	146		

* $.10 > p > .05$

TABLE 6
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CREDIBILITY (COMPETENCE)

	SS	df	MS	F
Between Conditions of Opinionatedness	24.6468	2	12.3234	4.1869**
Within Conditions of Opinionatedness	426.7856	145	2.9433	
Total	451.4324	147		

** significant at the .05 level

TABLE 7
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CREDIBILITY (DYNAMISM)

	SS	df	MS	F
Between Conditions of Opinionatedness	7.5014	2	3.7507	1.1590
Within Conditions of Opinionatedness	472.4583	146	3.2360	
Total	479.9597	148		

TABLE 8
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - CREDIBILITY (OBJECTIVITY)

	SS	df	MS	F
Between Conditions of Opinionatedness	58.5768	2	29.2884	7.6672****
Within Conditions of Opinionatedness	550.0762	144	3.8200	
Total	608.6531	146		

**** significant at the .005 level

TABLE 9
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE - MEMBER SATISFACTION

	SS	df	MS	F
Between Conditions of Opinionatedness	11.7658	2	5.8829	2.1089
Within Conditions of Opinionatedness	398.8986	143	2.7895	
Total	410.6644	145		

TABLE 10
NEWMAN-KEULS COMPARISON OF MEANS - CONSENSUS

Comparison		$\bar{X}_1$	$\bar{X}_2$	$\bar{D}$	q value
Opin.	v. Mod. Opin.	4.9375	6.3125	1.3750	5.5066 ***
Opin.	v. Unopin.	4.9375	5.6538	.7163	2.9272 **
Mod. Opin.	v. Unopin.	6.3125	5.6538	.6587	2.6918 *

*** significant at the .01 level
** significant at the .05 level
* $.10 > p > .05$

TABLE 11
NEWMAN-KEULS COMPARISON OF MEANS - CREDIBILITY (TRUSTWORTHINESS)

Comparison		$\bar{X}_1$	$\bar{X}_2$	$\bar{D}$	q value
Opin.	v. Mod. Opin.	4.9583	5.1458	.1875	7835
Opin.	v. Unopin.	4.9583	5.7255	.7672	3.2577 *
Mod. Opin.	v. Unopin.	5.1458	5.7255	.5797	2.4615 *

* $.10 > p > .05$

TABLE 12
NEWMAN-KEULS COMPARISON OF MEANS - CREDIBILITY (COMPETENCE)

Comparison		$\bar{X}_1$	$\bar{X}_2$	$\bar{D}$	q value
Opin.	v. Mod. Opin.	4.6170	5.2500	.6330	2.5472 *
Opin.	v. Unopin.	4.6170	5.6038	.9868	4.0709 **
Mod. Opin.	v. Unopin.	5.2500	5.6038	.3538	1.4668

** significant at the .05 level
* $.10 > p > .05$

TABLE 13
NEWMAN-KEULS COMPARISON OF MEANS - CREDIBILITY (OBJECTIVITY)

Comparison		$\bar{X}_1$	$\bar{X}_2$	$\bar{D}$	q value
Opin.	v. Mod. Opin.	3.8333	5.0851	1.2518	4.4217 **
Opin.	v. Unopin.	3.8333	5.2500	1.4167	5.1255 ***
Mod. Opin.	v. Unopin.	5.0851	5.2500	.1649	.5940

*** significant at the .01 level
** significant at the .05 level